medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The UK Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme and changes in diet, physical activity and sleep during the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from eight longitudinal studies

Authors: Bożena Wielgoszewska PhD [1]^, Jane Maddock PhD [2]^*, Michael J. Green PhD [3]^, Giorgio Di Gessa PhD [4]^, Sam Parsons PhD [1]^, Gareth J Griffith PhD[5], Jazz Croft PhD[5], Anna J. Stevenson PhD [6], Charlotte Booth PhD[1], Richard J. Silverwood PhD[1], David Bann PhD[1], Praveetha Patalay PhD[1,2], Alun D. Hughes PhD [2], Nishi Chaturvedi PhD[2], Laura D Howe PhD [4], Emla Fitzsimons PhD[1], Srinivasa Vittal Katikireddi PhD [3], George B. Ploubidis PhD [1*]

^joint first authors

[1] Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Social Research Institute, University College London

[2] MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing, University College London

[3] MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow

[4] Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care, University College London

[5] MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol

[6] Centre for Genomic and Experimental Medicine, University of Edinburgh

* Correspondence to: Dr. Jane Maddock jane.maddock@ucl.ac.uk or Professor George B. Ploubidis g.ploubidis@ucl.ac.uk, University College London, Gower St, Bloomsbury, London WC1E 6BT

Word count: 3484

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: In March 2020 the UK implemented the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (furlough) to minimize job losses. Our aim was to investigate associations between furlough and diet, physical activity, and sleep during the early stages of the pandemic.

Methods: We analysed data from 25,092 participants aged 16 to 66 years from eight UK longitudinal studies. Changes in employment (including being furloughed) were defined by comparing employment status pre- and during the first lockdown. Health behaviours included fruit and vegetable consumption, physical activity, and sleeping patterns. Study-specific estimates obtained using modified Poisson regression, adjusting for socio-demographic characteristics and pre-pandemic health and health behaviours, were statistically pooled. Associations were also stratified by sex, age, and education.

Findings: Across studies, between 8 and 25% of participants were furloughed. Compared to those who remained working, furloughed workers were slightly less likely to be physically inactive (RRR:0.85, [0.75-0.97], $I^{2=}$58.7%) and did not differ in diet and sleep behaviours. In stratified analyses, furlough was associated with low fruit and vegetable consumption among males (RRR=1.11; 95%CI: 1.01-1.22; I^2: 0%) but not females (RRR=0.84; 95%CI: 0.68-1.04; I^2: 65%). Considering change in behaviour, furloughed workers were more likely than those who remained working to report increased fruit and vegetable consumption, exercise, and hours of sleep.

*Interpretation***:** Those furloughed exhibited broadly similar levels of health behaviours with those who remained in employment during the initial stages of the pandemic. Social protection policies in the post-pandemic recovery period and during future economic crises may help protect population health.

Funding: Medical Research Council.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

COVID-19 disease, social distancing measures and a series of lockdowns have affected the economy and employment rates in the United Kingdom (UK) and worldwide (1,2). The current pandemic has also resulted in health care disruptions and closures of some sectors of the economy including exercise facilities. This unique situation makes it difficult to predict the short and long-term effects of pandemic-related unemployment on population health and health related behaviours.

Social protection policies introduced during the pandemic may modify the health consequences of the COVID-19-related economic downturn. The UK Government launched their Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (CJRS) in March 2020. The CJRS, widely referred to as 'furlough', provides employees unable to work due to the pandemic with 80% of pay (capped at £2,500 per month) (3). By March 2021, 11.4 million employees (approximately 34% of those over 16 years in employment) had been furloughed through the CJRS and the number of people claiming unemployment-related benefits had increased by 1.4 million from March 2020 (4). These economic changes have not affected all groups equally. Younger workers, low earners and women, were more likely to work in disrupted sectors, and therefore become unemployed or be furloughed (4,5).

The relationship between government interventions, particularly those focused on mitigating the impact of lockdown and economic downturns via subsidised employment, and health is poorly understood. The CJRS may impact health through its influence on health behaviours. We aimed to investigate associations between changes in employment status (with a focus on the UK's furlough scheme) during the early stages of the pandemic and health behaviours, namely diet, physical activity and sleep by conducting coordinated analyses of data from more than 25,000 participants in eight longitudinal studies. We hypothesised that associations differ by participant characteristics, therefore we also examined associations stratified by sex, education, and age.

Methods:

Participants

The UK National Core Studies Longitudinal Health and Wellbeing initiative is drawing together data from multiple UK population-based longitudinal studies using coordinated analysis to answer priority pandemic-related questions. By conducting similar analyses within each study and pooling results in a meta-analysis, we can provide robust evidence to understand how the pandemic has impacted population

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

health and support efforts to mitigate its effects going forward. Data here were from eight long running UK population-based longitudinal studies which conducted surveys during the pandemic. Details of the design, sample frames, current age range, timing of the most recent pre-pandemic and COVID surveys, response rates, and sample size are in Supplementary Table S1.

Five studies were age homogenous birth cohorts (where all individuals within each study were similar age): the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS); the index children from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC-G1); Next Steps (NS, formerly the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England); the 1970 British Cohort Study (BCS70); and the 1958 National Child Development Study (NCDS). Three age heterogeneous studies (each covering a range of age groups) were included: Understanding Society (USOC); the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA); and Generation Scotland: the Scottish Family Health Study (GS). Finally, the parents of the ALSPAC-G1 cohort were treated as a fourth age heterogeneous study population (ALSPAC-G0).

Analytical samples were restricted to working age participants, defined as those aged 16 to 66 (the current state pension age in the UK(6)), who had recorded at least one health behaviour outcome in a COVID-19 survey and had valid data on all covariates. Each study was weighted to restore representativeness to its target population, accounting for sampling design and differential non-response (7).

Measures

Below we describe all variables in the analysis. Full details of the questions and coding used within each cohort are in Supplementary File 2.

Exposure: Employment status change

Employment status change (or stability) was coded in six categories based on the status both prior to the pandemic and at their first COVID-19 survey: stable employed (reference group); furloughed (i.e. from work to furlough); no longer employed (i.e. from employed to non-employed); became employed (i.e. from non-employed to employed); stable unemployed (i.e. unemployed at both points); and stable non-employed (i.e. not available for employment at either point, including in education, early retirement, caring responsibilities, sick or disabled).

Outcomes: Health behaviours

We examined diet, physical activity, and sleep. Participants self-reported fruit and vegetable consumption (≤2 portions per day vs more portions (8)), time spent exercising (<3 days a week for 30 minutes or more

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

vs more frequent exercise within recommended levels (9)), and hours of sleep (outside the typical range of 6-9 hours vs within that range (10)) both during and pre-pandemic. However, this information, used for our main analyses, was only available in some studies (MCS, NS, BCS, NCDS, USOC), whereas others (ALSPAC, GS, ELSA) only had information on change since the start of the pandemic (see Supplementary File 2). Based on these levels *or* on the information on changes in health behaviours since the start of the pandemic, we additionally created dichotomous outcomes indicating change from before to during the pandemic (in comparison to no change or change in the other direction): more portions of fruit/vegetables; fewer portions of fruit/vegetables; more time spent exercising; less time spent exercising; more hours of sleep; fewer hours of sleep; a shift from outside to within the typical sleep range of 6-9 hours; and a shift from within to outside the typical sleep range of 6-9 hours. All information on behaviours during the pandemic was from surveys conducted between April and July 2020 (inclusive).

Confounders and Moderators:

Potential confounders included: sex; ethnicity (non-white ethnic minority vs white -including white ethnic minorities); age; education (degree vs no degree); UK nation (i.e. England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland or other); household composition (based on presence of a spouse/partner and presence of children); pre-pandemic psychological distress; pre-pandemic self-rated health (excellent-good vs fair-poor); and pre-pandemic health behaviour measures, where available.

We examined modification of the associations by sex, education, and age in three categories: 16-29; 30-49; and 50 years or more (with age-homogeneous cohorts included in the relevant band).

Analysis

Within each study, each outcome was regressed on employment status change, using a modified Poisson model with robust standard errors that returns risk ratios for ease of interpretation and to avoid issues related to non-collapsibility of odds ratios (11,12). After estimating unadjusted associations, confounder adjustment was performed in two steps. First, a “basic” adjustment including socio-demographic characteristics: age (only in age-heterogeneous studies), sex, ethnicity (except the BCS and NCDS cohorts which were nearly entirely white), education, UK nation (except ALSPAC, GS and ELSA which only had participants from a single country), and household composition. Second, a “full” adjustment additionally including pre-pandemic measures of: psychological distress, self-rated health, and health behaviours. Moderation by sex, age, and education was assessed with stratified regressions using “full” adjustment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Both stages of adjustment are relevant because our exposure, employment change, incorporates pre-pandemic employment status, which may have influenced other pre-pandemic characteristics such as mental health, self-rated health, and health behaviours (see supplementary Figure S8). By not controlling for these pre-pandemic characteristics, the basic adjusted risk ratios may represent both newly acquired behaviour and/or continuation of established (pre-pandemic) behaviour. In contrast, the full adjustment risk ratios block effects via these pre-pandemic characteristics and can therefore be interpreted as representing the differential change in health behaviour between exposure groups which is independent of these pre-pandemic characteristics. For the outcomes that directly capture changes in health behaviour, the full adjustment did not include pre-pandemic levels of the behaviour in question, as pre-pandemic levels of that behaviour are incorporated within the change outcome. This means that even full adjustment risk ratios estimated for these outcomes may partially reflect associations with pre-pandemic behaviour.

The overall and stratified results from each study were pooled using a random effects meta-analysis with restricted maximum likelihood in Stata 16. Moderation was assessed by comparing the magnitude and confidence intervals of the pooled estimates from stratified models. Some studies could not contribute estimates for every comparison due to differences in the ages sampled, measures used, and sparsity of data. For a small number of exposure-outcome comparisons, reliable estimates could not be computed because the outcome prevalence was low (≤2). While such selective exclusion could potentially lead to bias, the low numbers of events mean that the corresponding within-study estimates would be so imprecise that their exclusion is unlikely to lead to considerable bias (see Supplementary File 3 for more details and sensitivity analyses showing that results were robust to different low cell count exclusion thresholds). We report heterogeneity using the I^2 statistic: 0% indicates estimates were similar across studies, while values closer to 100% represent greater heterogeneity. While we could have undertaken multivariate meta-analysis of all exposure categories simultaneously, for ease of interpretation we instead conducted a series of univariate meta-analyses, bearing in mind the consistency of results from these approaches generally observed elsewhere (13,14). We performed a multivariate meta-analysis with one outcome in a subset of the studies as a sensitivity analysis, and differences from the individual univariate meta-analyses were negligible (results not shown).

Results

Analyses included 25,092 individuals from eight studies (see Supplementary Table S3 for demographic characteristics). Figure 1 shows employment status change during the first lockdown of the pandemic. Around six in 10 participants in NS, BCS, GS, USOC, and ALSPAC were employed prior to and during the initial stages of the pandemic, with the younger (MCS) and older studies (ELSA and NCDS) showing

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

lower levels of stable employment. Prevalence of furlough ranged between 8% (GS) and 25% (NS). Across most studies approximately 3% of participants were no longer employed during the pandemic (8% in ALSPAC G0). Stable unemployment ranged in prevalence between 1% (GS) and 9% (ALSPAC G0). Supplementary Table S4 shows how economic activity was patterned by education, sex, and age-groups, with furlough generally more common among younger, female and less educated participants and stable employment especially common among male, higher educated and middle-aged participants. There were no clear patterns across studies with regard to who was no longer employed during the pandemic.

Table 1 shows the prevalence of health behaviours and changes in behaviour by study. Proportions reporting eating no more than 2 portions of fruit or vegetables per day and reporting three or less days a week with at least 30 minutes of exercise were similar both pre- and during the pandemic, whereas sleep outside of the typical range of 6-9 hours was more common during the pandemic in most studies (USOC was an exception). Nevertheless, changes in all three behaviours were common in both directions. In the four national birth cohorts (which used identical questions), more participants reported increasing their fruit and vegetable consumption and exercise than those who reported decreases, while reporting more hours of sleep and shifts to sleep outside the typical range, were more common than reporting fewer hours of sleep, or shifts from outside to within the typical range.

Pooled Analysis

Figure 2 shows meta-analysis estimates from unadjusted, basic adjusted, and fully adjusted models for levels of fruit and vegetable consumption, physical activity, and sleep during the pandemic. Given our primary interest in investigating health behaviours of those furloughed, no longer employed and stable unemployed compared to those in stable employment, we only present results for these groups (omitting those who became employed or were in stable non-employment). Figure 3 shows pooled estimates from fully adjusted models stratified by sex, education and age. Stratified estimates were largely consistent with the main results, though we highlight some differences below. Full details of the meta-analysis including overall and stratified estimates from each study are available in Supplementary File 3.

Fruit and vegetable consumption

Unadjusted estimates indicated lower fruit and vegetable consumption among those furloughed or in stable unemployment than among those in stable employment. These differences were robust to the basic adjustment, but were attenuated with full adjustment for pre-pandemic characteristics, suggesting that these associations are attributable to differences in dietary habits established prior to the pandemic. There

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

were no clear differences in diet between those in stable employment and those who were no longer employed during the pandemic.

In stratified analyses, furlough was associated with lower fruit and vegetable consumption among men (RRR=1.11; 95%CI: 1.01-1.22; I^2: 0%) but not women (RRR=0.84; 95%CI: 0.68-1.04; I^2: 65%), and there were similar differences in estimates for those no longer employed and in stable unemployment (but CIs for male estimates crossed the null). Thus, there was some evidence for detrimental impacts of furlough on diet among men, even after accounting for pre-pandemic behaviours.

Physical Activity

Compared to stable employment, furlough was associated with lower risk of infrequent physical activity. In contrast, those no longer employed or in stable unemployment had higher risk of low physical activity (though confidence intervals only clearly differed from the null for those in stable unemployment). These associations were attenuated in the full adjustment models, so again likely reflect physical activity behaviours already established prior to the pandemic. Associations between infrequent exercise and stable unemployment were clearest among those with less than degree-level education (RRR=1.32; 95%CI: 1.03-1.68; I^2: 59%) and in the 30-49 year age group (RRR=1.49; 95%CI: 1.15-1.72; I^2: 0%).

Sleep

All three groups, furloughed, no longer employed, and stable unemployment, were more likely than those in stable employment to have atypical sleep. These associations were partly attenuated in the basic adjustment and further attenuated in the full adjustment models, so were at least partially accounted for by pre-pandemic characteristics and behaviours. Estimates for sleep exhibited high heterogeneity with I^2 values largely over 80%, perhaps partly due to age differences between the samples (see below).

The heightened risk of atypical sleep for those not in stable employment appeared to be largely concentrated at younger ages. For example, stable unemployment was associated with an RRR of 2.75 (95%CI: 1.63-4.63; I^2: 0%) in the 16-29 year age group, compared with 0.98 (95%CI: 0.53-1.80; I^2: 61%) in the 50+ age group. Age patterning was similar for those no longer employed, and similar though less pronounced for furlough. Thus, in this youngest age group, even after adjusting for pre-pandemic characteristics, there was evidence that atypical sleep was associated with stable unemployment (see above for RRR) or being no longer employed (RRR=3.80; 95%CI: 2.35-6.15; single estimate from MCS), but there was not a clear association with furlough (RRR=1.39; 95%CI: 0.31-6.16; I^2: 91%). The two studies that had provided estimates for furlough in this age group had shown very different findings (raised risk in MCS but lower risk in USOC). Evidence for an association between stable unemployment

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

and atypical sleep was also clearer among men (RRR=2.09; 95%CI: 1.04-4.20; I^2: 71%) than women (RRR=1.31; 95%CI: 0.54-3.17; I^2: 86%).

Changes in Behaviour

Pooled estimates for the outcomes indicating change in behaviour are presented in Supplementary Tables S5, S6 and S7. These analyses indicated that furlough was associated with increases in fruit and vegetable consumption, time spent exercising and hours of sleep relative to stable employment. Furlough was also associated with a higher likelihood of shifts both into and out of the typical 6-9 hour sleep range, which is probably due to the strong association with increased hours of sleep (which was present in all stratified analyses). These associations were robust to adjustment for other pre-pandemic characteristics, though, by the nature of change outcomes, may still partially represent pre-pandemic differences in each behaviour. Largely similar patterns were seen for: sleep among those no longer employed or in stable employment; and for physical activity among those no longer employed.

Discussion

We find evidence that being furloughed was somewhat protective against unhealthy behaviours. Those who were furloughed did not differ in fruit and vegetable consumption or sleep and had a lower likelihood of infrequent exercise compared to those who remained employed. Stratified analyses showed that furloughed men, but not women, had a higher likelihood of low fruit and vegetable consumption than those who remained employed. Those who remained unemployed had worse health behaviours relative to the stable employed, although these differences were largely due to pre-pandemic behaviours. Infrequent exercise was more common among the stable unemployed for those with no degree and those in the 30-49 age group. Among 16-29 year olds, who were no longer employed or remained unemployed, there was a higher risk of atypical asleep. Men who remained unemployed were more likely to have atypical sleep than women.

Previous studies on subsidised employment policies have shown beneficial effects (15). Evidence from Sweden (16) shows that individuals in subsidised employment occupied an intermediate position in terms of subjective well-being; they were better-off than unemployed individuals, but worse-off than those in regular employment. Here, we have only observed minor differences between those furloughed and those in stable employment, which may be due to the nature of the CJRS scheme and/or differences in the outcomes studied. Studies conducted since the Covid-19 pandemic have shown that for some, health behaviours improved while for others they declined (17,18), and our findings suggest that furlough may have, mainly, protected against the latter.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Unemployment has been shown to have detrimental effects on population health through various pathways including health-related behaviours (19–21). These health effects may be modified by the type of welfare state regime in place and related social protection policies (22). Employment is generally associated with good health (23), while job loss or unemployment are associated with deleterious health outcomes (24), especially among men and those in their early and middle careers (23). While we observed similar findings for those unemployed prior and during the pandemic, we did not replicate the detrimental impact of job loss. However, largely because of the furlough scheme, participants who were no longer working during the initial stages of the pandemic were rare (~3%) and formed a heterogenous group at the early stages of the pandemic, whereas job loss in non-pandemic times is generally characterised by disadvantaged socio-economic position.

While research combining results from several UK prospective studies makes a clear contribution to understanding the impact of the furlough scheme, there are limitations that should be taken into account while interpreting our findings. Firstly, we were not able to achieve full harmonisation of measures across studies. By focusing on comparable measures we also limited our scope to explore other aspects of diet, physical activity or sleep (such as frequency of snacking, specific kinds of physical activity, or sleep quality). Furthermore, outcomes were only analysed during the initial stages of the pandemic (April-July 2020) and relationships may change with subsequent changes to restrictions and growing economic uncertainty. Further research is needed to examine this as well as heterogeneity in the stable employed and furloughed groups in greater detail.

Despite being embedded in long standing studies, surveys during the pandemic were selective. While we corrected for this using weights derived for each study, bias due to selective non-response cannot be excluded (25). Similarly, bias due to unmeasured confounding cannot be ruled out and could be influential considering the small magnitude of the risk ratios observed. For example, there may be unobserved differences between participants whose jobs were retained, versus those who experienced furlough or job loss. Our fully adjusted models account for differences in some key pre-pandemic characteristics among employment groups. However, it is possible that our results reflect other traits of these employment groups, for example, how workers in different industries or occupational classes are responding to the pandemic, rather than being effects of furlough specifically. Adjustment for pre-pandemic characteristics may have induced bias if there were unobserved determinants of both pre-pandemic characteristics and behaviour during the pandemic. However, we observed only minor differences between those furloughed and those who remained employed, therefore any bias due to unmeasured confounding is unlikely to change the interpretation of our findings.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Our analyses on outcomes of change in behaviour during the pandemic showed some differences from the main analyses. Specifically, they indicated that being furloughed was associated with increased fruit and vegetable consumption, hours of sleep and time spent exercising relative to maintaining stable employment. There may be several reasons for this: the change analyses included more studies, which implies a greater variability in measurement; these outcomes could have been picking up relatively minor changes in behaviour above or below the thresholds used in the main analyses and could still partially be reflecting effects of initial employment status on pre-pandemic diet, physical activity or sleep.

Despite the economic disruption of the pandemic and lockdown, participants who were no longer working during the initial stages of the pandemic were rare, while much higher proportions participated in the UK CJR furlough scheme. We found that those who were furloughed exhibited broadly similar levels of health behaviours to those who remained in employment and some evidence of less risk for infrequent exercise. Continuation of the UK CJR furlough scheme has the potential to mitigate some of the adverse consequences of the pandemic and may help to protect population health. Our evidence suggests that the UK furlough scheme may be an important component of policies aiming to mitigate the determinantal effects of economic downturns and prevent exacerbation of inequalities.

Data sharing statement: All datasets included in this analysis have established data sharing processes, and for most included studies the anonymised datasets with corresponding documentation can be downloaded for use by researchers from the UK Data Service. We have detailed the exact processes for each dataset in Supplementary Table S2.

Acknowledgements

The contributing studies have been made possible because of the tireless dedication, commitment and enthusiasm of the many people who have taken part. We would like to thank the participants and the numerous team members involved in the studies including interviewers, technicians, researchers, administrators, managers, health professionals and volunteers. We are additionally grateful to our funders for their financial input and support in making this research happen.

GS: Drew Altschul, Chloe Fawns-Ritchie, Archie Campbell, Robin Flaig.

ALSPAC: Daniel J Smith, Nicholas J Timpson, Kate Northstone

Understanding Society: Michaela Benzeval

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

NSHD: Andrew Wong, Maria Popham, Karen MacKinnon, Imran Shah, Philip Curran

MCS, NS, BCS70, NCDS: Colleagues in survey, data and cohort maintenance teams

Funding acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Core Studies, an initiative funded by UKRI, NIHR and the Health and Safety Executive. The COVID-19 Longitudinal Health and Wellbeing National Core Study was funded by the Medical Research Council (MC_PC_20030).

Understanding Society is an initiative funded by the Economic and Social Research Council and various Government Departments, with scientific leadership by the Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, and survey delivery by NatCen Social Research and Kantar Public. The Understanding Society COVID-19 study is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ES/K005146/1) and the Health Foundation (2076161). The research data are distributed by the UK Data Service.

The Millennium Cohort Study, Next Steps, British Cohort Study 1970 and National Child Development Study 1958 are supported by the Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Resource Centre 2015-20 grant (ES/M001660/1) and a host of other co-funders. The NSHD cohort is hosted by the MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL funded by the Medical Research Council (MC_UU_00019/1Theme 1: Cohorts and Data Collection). The COVID-19 data collections in these five cohorts were funded by the UKRI grant Understanding the economic, social and health impacts of COVID-19 using lifetime data: evidence from 5 nationally representative UK cohorts (ES/V012789/1).

The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing was developed by a team of researchers based at University College London, NatCen Social Research, the Institute for Fiscal Studies, the University of Manchester and the University of East Anglia. The data were collected by NatCen Social Research. The funding is currently provided by the National Institute on Aging in the US, and a consortium of UK government departments coordinated by the National Institute for Health Research. Funding has also been received by the Economic and Social Research Council. The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing Covid-19 Substudy was supported by the UK Economic and Social Research Grant (ESRC) ES/V003941/1.

The UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome (Grant Ref: 217065/Z/19/Z) and the University of Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC. A comprehensive list of grants funding is available on the ALSPAC website (http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf). We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for their help in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists and nurses. The second COVID-19 data sweep was also supported by the Faculty Research Director's discretionary fund, University of Bristol.

TwinsUK receives funding from the Wellcome Trust (WT212904/Z/18/Z), the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre based at Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. TwinsUK is also supported by the Chronic Disease Research Foundation and Zoe Global Ltd. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Generation Scotland received core support from the Chief Scientist Office of the Scottish Government Health Directorates [CZD/16/6] and the Scottish Funding Council [HR03006]. Genotyping of the GS:SFHS samples was carried out by the Genetics Core Laboratory at the Wellcome Trust Clinical Research Facility, Edinburgh, Scotland and was funded by the Medical Research Council UK and the Wellcome Trust (Wellcome Trust Strategic Award "STratifying Resilience and Depression Longitudinally" (STRADL) Reference 104036/Z/14/Z). Generation Scotland is funded by the Wellcome Trust (216767/Z/19/Z).

SVK acknowledges funding from a NRS Senior Clinical Fellowship (SCAF/15/02), the Medical Research Council (MC_UU_00022/2) and the Scottish Government Chief Scientist Office (SPHSU17). GJG acknowledges funding from the ESRC (ES/T009101/1). EJT acknowledges funding from the Wellcome Trust (WT212904/Z/18/Z). DB acknowledges funding from the Medical Research Council (MR/V002147/1).

Role of funder. The funders had no role in the methodology, analysis or interpretation of the findings presented in this manuscript.

Declaration of interests

No conflicts of interest were declared by BW, JM, MJG, GDG, SP, GJG, JC, AJS, CB, RJS, DB, PP, LDH, EF, GBP. SVK is a member of the Scientific Advisory Group on Emergencies subgroup on ethnicity and COVID-19 and is co-chair of the Scottish Government's Ethnicity Reference Group on COVID-19. NC serves on a data safety monitoring board for trials sponsored by Astra-Zeneca. ADH serves on the PHOSP COVID Cardiovascular Working group.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Author Contribution Statement

Ploubidis, Katikireddi, Patalay and Chaturvedi conceptualised the study and design. Wielgoszewska. Maddock. Green, Di Gessa, Parsons, Ploubidis, Katikireddi, Griffith and Silverwood designed the methodology. Wielgoszewska. Maddock, Green, Di Gessa, Parsons, Croft, Stevenson, Booth and Griffith conducted the formal analysis. Maddock, Green, Di Gessa, Stevenson, Griffith, Chaturvedi, Howe and Fitzsimons were responsible for data curation. Wielgoszewska, Maddock. Green, Di Gessa, and Parsons wrote the original draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to critical revision of the manuscript. Green and Di Gessa contributed to data visualisation. The project was supervised by Ploubidis and Katikireddi. Funding was acquired by Patalay, Katikireddi, Ploubidis, Silverwood, and Chaturvedi.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and the latest indicators for the UK economy and society: 18 February 2021 [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb 19]. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronavirustheukeconomyandsocietyfasterindicators/18february2021

2. International Monetary Fund. The Great Lockdown: Worst Economic Downturn Since the Great Depression [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 May 19]. Available from: https://blogs.imf.org/2020/04/14/the-great-lockdown-worst-economic-downturn-since-the-great-depression/

3. Dias MC, Joyce R, Postel-Vinay F, Xu X. The challenges for labour market policy during the Covid-19 pandemic [Internet]. The IFS; [cited 2021 Apr 16]. Available from: https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/14767

4. Powell A, Francis-Devine B, Foley N. Coronavirus: Impact on the labour market [Internet]. House of Commons Library; 2021 [cited 2021 May 19]. Available from: https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-8898/

5. Adams-Prassl A, Boneva T, Golin M, Rauh C. Furloughing*. Fisc Stud [Internet]. 2020 Sep 1 [cited 2021 Jun 3];41(3):591–622. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1475-5890.12242

6. Moizer J, Farrar S, Hyde M. UK state pension deferral incentives and sustainability. Appl Econ [Internet]. 2018 May 3 [cited 2021 May 19];50(21):2356–68. Available from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00036846.2017.1397850

7. Brown M, Goodman A, Peters, A., Ploubidis, G.B., Sanchez A, Silverwood R, Smith K. COVID-19 Survey in Five National Longitudinal Studies: Waves 1 and 2 User Guide (Version 2) [Internet]. London; 2020 [cited 2021 May 19]. Available from: https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/covid-19-survey/content-and-data/

8. Aune D, Giovannucci E, Boffetta P, Fadnes LT, Keum NN, Norat T, et al. Fruit and vegetable intake and the risk of cardiovascular disease, total cancer and all-cause mortality-A systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. Int J Epidemiol [Internet]. 2017 Jun 1 [cited 2021 May 19];46(3):1029–56. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28338764/

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

9. Department of Health and Social Care. UK Chief Medical Officers' Physical Activity Guidelines. 2019.

10. United Kingdom National Health Service. How to get to sleep - NHS [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021 May 19]. Available from: https://www.nhs.uk/live-well/sleep-and-tiredness/how-to-get-to-sleep/

11. Zou G. A Modified Poisson Regression Approach to Prospective Studies with Binary Data. Am J Epidemiol [Internet]. 2004 Apr 1 [cited 2021 May 19];159(7):702–6. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15033648/

12. Pang M, Kaufman JS, Platt RW. Studying noncollapsibility of the odds ratio with marginal structural and logistic regression models. Stat Methods Med Res [Internet]. 2016 Oct 1 [cited 2021 May 19];25(5):1925–37. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24108272/

13. Trikalinos TA, Hoaglin DC, Schmid CH. An empirical comparison of univariate and multivariate meta-analyses for categorical outcomes. Stat Med [Internet]. 2014 Apr 30 [cited 2021 May 19];33(9):1441–59. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/sim.6044

14. Price MJ, Blake HA, Kenyon S, White IR, Jackson D, Kirkham JJ, et al. Empirical comparison of univariate and multivariate meta-analyses in Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth reviews with multiple binary outcomes. Res Synth Methods [Internet]. 2019 Sep 1 [cited 2021 May 19];10(3):440–51. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/jrsm.1353

15. Puig-Barrachina V, Giró P, Artazcoz L, Bartoll X, Cortés-Franch I, Fernández A, et al. The impact of Active Labour Market Policies on health outcomes: A Scoping review [Internet]. Vol. 30, European Journal of Public Health. Oxford University Press; 2020 [cited 2021 May 19]. p. 36–42. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/eurpub/article/30/1/36/5419277

16. Korpi T. Is utility related to employment status? Employment, unemployment, labor market policies and subjective well-being among Swedish youth. Labour Econ. 1997 Jun 1;4(2):125–47.

17. Bann D, Villadsen A, Maddock J, Hughes A, Ploubidis GB, Silverwood R, et al. Changes in the behavioural determinants of health during the COVID-19 pandemic: gender, socioeconomic and ethnic inequalities in five British cohort studies. J Epidemiol Community Health [Internet]. 2021 May 26 [cited 2021 May 27];0:jech-2020-215664. Available from: https://jech.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/jech-2020-215664

18. Niedzwiedz CL, Green MJ, Benzeval M, Campbell D, Craig P, Demou E, et al. Mental health and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

health behaviours before and during the initial phase of the COVID-19 lockdown: Longitudinal analyses of the UK Household Longitudinal Study. J Epidemiol Community Health [Internet]. 2021 Mar 1 [cited 2021 Jun 7];75(3):224–31. Available from: http://jech.bmj.com/

19. Dorling D. Unemployment and health [Internet]. Vol. 338, BMJ (Online). British Medical Journal Publishing Group; 2009 [cited 2021 Jun 3]. p. 1091. Available from: https://www.bmj.com/content/338/bmj.b829

20. Bartley M. Unemployment and ill health: Understanding the relationship. J Epidemiol Community Health. 1994;48(4):333–7.

21. Kim TJ, Von Dem Knesebeck O. Is an insecure job better for health than having no job at all? A systematic review of studies investigating the health-related risks of both job insecurity and unemployment. BMC Public Health [Internet]. 2015 Sep 29 [cited 2021 Jun 3];15(1). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26419739/

22. Bambra C. Work, worklessness and the political economy of health inequalities. J Epidemiol Community Health [Internet]. 2011 Sep 1 [cited 2021 May 4];65(9):746–50. Available from: https://jech.bmj.com/content/65/9/746

23. Roelfs DJ, Shor E, Davidson KW, Schwartz JE. Losing life and livelihood: A systematic review and meta-analysis of unemployment and all-cause mortality. Soc Sci Med [Internet]. 2011 Mar [cited 2021 May 19];72(6):840–54. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21330027/

24. Nandi A, Charters TJ, Strumpf EC, Heymann J, Harper S. Economic conditions and health behaviours during the “Great Recession.” J Epidemiol Community Health [Internet]. 2013 Dec 1 [cited 2021 May 19];67(12):1038–46. Available from: https://jech.bmj.com/content/67/12/1038

25. Mostafa T, Narayanan M, Pongiglione B, Dodgeon B, Goodman A, Silverwood RJ, et al. Missing at random assumption made more plausible: evidence from the 1958 British birth cohort. J Clin Epidemiol. 2021 Aug 1;136:44–54.

Table 1: Percent (and N) distribution of health behaviours and changes during the pandemic by study.

	MCS	NS	BCS	NCDS	GS	USOC	ELSA	ALSPAC G0	ALSPAC G1
	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	
Age range of participants	**18-20**	**29-31**	**50**	**62**	**27-66**	**17-66**	**52-66**	**44-66**	**27-29**
Diet									
Pre-pandemic: ≤ 2 portions of fruit & vegetables, % (n)	39 (657)	27.8 (384)	24.9 (673)	22.4 (853)	NA	26.5 (1070)	NA	NA	NA
During pandemic: ≤ 2 portions of fruit & vegetables, % (n)	33.3 (564)	26.1 (393)	25.3 (676)	21.9 (808)	NA	29.3 (1271)	NA	NA	NA
Eating fewer portions of fruit & vegetables, % (n)	17.1 (365)	15.2 (282)	14.9 (450)	10.9 (419)	NA	48.2 (2823)	NA	NA	NA
Eating more portions of fruit & vegetables, % (n)	32 (651)	21.5 (344)	17.2 (528)	14.6 (655)	NA	42.2 (2596)	NA	NA	NA
Physical Activity (PA)									
Pre-pandemic: ≤ 3 days a week of at least 30m exercise, % (n)	43.4 (885)	46.9 (704)	43.5 (1319)	41.5 (1744)	22.7 (594)	21.2 (1181)	NA	NA	NA
During pandemic: ≤ 3 days a week of at least 30m exercise, % (n)	42.9 (803)	44.5 (677)	38.4 (1099)	39.9 (1588)	26.3 (608)	20.3 (994)	NA	NA	NA
Less PA/fewer days of +30m exercise	33.6 (622)	29.7 (445)	20.5 (624)	18.2 (787)	31.7 (804)	49.3 (2824)	36.0 (869)	33.5 (693)	38.5 (491)
More PA/days of at least 30m exercise, % (n)	37.8 (750)	35.4 (544)	31.6 (1074)	26.8 (1232)	23.4 (658)	47.4 (3056)	23.3 (563)	44.4 (919)	42.5 (542)
Sleep									
Pre-pandemic: # hours/day, mean (95% CI)	7.48 [7.38-7.58]	7.13 [7.04-7.21]	6.88 [6.82-6.95]	6.93 [6.87-6.99]	7.09 [7.04-7.13]	6.82 [6.77-6.88]	NA	NA	NA
During pandemic: # hours/day,	8.12	7.41	6.98	6.99	7.10	7.01	NA	NA	NA

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

mean (95% CI)	[7.99-8.25]	[7.29-7.54]	[6.90-7.06]	[6.92-7.07]	[7.05-7.15]	[6.95-7.07]			
Pre-pandemic: <6 or 9+ hours a night, % (n)	12.0 (223)	6.8 (107)	10.3 (229)	10.2 (323)	9.3 (243)	14.6 (740)	NA	NA	NA
During pandemic: <6 or 9+ hours a night, % (n)	29.9 (569)	15.9 (231)	17.1 (430)	16.3 (540)	13.5 (347)	12.2 (673)	NA	NA	NA
From 6/9h a night to outside typical range, % (n)	24.6 (465)	12.0 (171)	9.6 (276)	7.8 (287)	9.0 (235)	5.4 (321)	NA	NA	NA
From outside typical range to 6/9h a night, % (n)	6.6 (118)	2.8 (47)	2.7 (74)	1.5 (68)	5.9 (171)	7.6 (370)	NA	NA	NA
Sleeps less than before, % (n)	23 (403)	22 (335)	19.6 (614)	16.7 (623)	21.4 (532)	30.8 (1903)	25.6 (618)	20.9 (432)	22.0 (280)
Sleeps more than before, % (n)	54.1 (1093)	36.3 (543)	27.6 (879)	21.7 (937)	22.1 (599)	44.6 (2482)	10.3 (249)	21.2 (439)	36.3 (462)
N participants	1924	1493	3050	4195	2618	6051	2417	2071	1273

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.08.21258531; this version posted June 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure legends

Figure 1: Percent distribution of change in employment status during the pandemic by study.

Sources: MCS (2020); NS (2020); BCS (2020); NCDS (2020); GS(2020); USoc (2020); ELSA (2020); ALSPAC (2020). The values in bracket next to each study represent the age range of participants at the time of data collection. Weighted data analyses. Analysis for GS, USOC, and ELSA restricted to participants aged 66 and younger. For more information about the questions asked in each dataset to derive changes in economic activity, please see the Supplementary File 2.

Figure 2: Associations between changes in employment status during the pandemic and health behaviours in pooled analyses across eight UK longitudinal studies

Basic' adjustment includes age, sex, ethnicity, education, UK nation, and household composition. 'Full' adjustment additionally includes pre-pandemic measures of mental health, self-rated health, diet, exercise and sleep.

Figure 3: Associations between economic activity during the pandemic and health behaviours, stratified by age, sex and educational attainment

*No I2 value as only one study was able to provide an estimate.


100%
90%
80%
70%
60%
50%
40%
30%
20%
10%
0%
MCS (18-20)
NS (29-31)
BCS (50)
NCDS (62)
GS (27-66)
USOC (17-66)
ELSA (52-66)
ALSPAC G0 (44-66)
ALSPAC G1 (27-29)
Stable employed
Furloughed
No longer employed
Became employed
Stable unemployed
Stable non-employed


Furloughed (vs Stable Employed)
No Longer Employed (vs Stable Employed)
Stable Unemployed (vs Stable Employed)
Outcome
Less than 2 portions of fruit/veg per day
Less than 3 days with 30+m exercise
Sleep outside normal range (6−9 hours)
I²: 0%
I²: 24%
I²: 42%
I²: 52%
I²: 58%
I²: 59%
I²: 85%
I²: 85%
I²: 84%
I²: 47%
I²: 31%
I²: 0%
I²: 47%
I²: 37%
I²: 40%
I²: 83%
I²: 80%
I²: 82%
I²: 0%
I²: 0%
I²: 0%
I²: 69%
I²: 59%
I²: 62%
I²: 83%
I²: 79%
I²: 86%
1
2
4
Relative Risk Ratio
Adjustment Level
Unadjusted
Basic Adjustment
Full Adjustment


Furloughed (vs Stable Employed)
No Longer Employed (vs Stable Employed)
Stable Unemployed (vs Stable Employed)
Outcome
Less than 2 portions of fruit/veg per day
Less than 3 days with 30+m exercise
Sleep outside normal range (6−9 hours)
I²: 0%
I²: 0%
I²: 67%
I²: 0%
I²: 76%
I²: 0%
I²: 65%
I²: 42%
I²: 68%
I²: 66%
I²: 0%
I²: 60%
I²: 0%
I²: 41%
I²: 0%
I²: 59%
I²: 46%
I²: 37%
I²: 91%
I²: 62%
I²: 66%
I²: 25%
I²: 84%
I²: 84%
I²: 0%
I²: 60%
I²: 45%
I²: 0%
I²: 70%
I²: 0%
I²: 50%
I²: 0%
I²: 0%
I²: 0%
I²: 73%
*
I²: 53%
I²: 0%
I²: 1%
I²: 40%
I²: 56%
I²: 45%
*
I²: 72%
I²: 13%
I²: 74%
I²: 69%
I²: 82%
I²: 65%
I²: 69%
I²: 88%
I²: 0%
I²: 82%
I²: 64%
I²: 0%
I²: 0%
I²: 0%
I²: 0%
I²: 92%
I²: 59%
I²: 67%
I²: 50%
I²: 57%
I²: 62%
I²: 61%
I²: 71%
I²: 0%
I²: 82%
I²: 36%
I²: 71%
I²: 86%
I²: 86%
0.5
1.0
2.0
4.0
6.0
Relative Risk Ratio
Stratification Group
Age 50+ years
Age 30−49 years
Age 16−29 years
No Degree
Degree
Male
Female
Overall